

Date: Wed, 14 Apr 93 13:16:03 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #96
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 14 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 96

Today's Topics:

 1500 watts too much? (6 msgs)
 CW = effective utilization?
 Let each determine their own incentive! (2 msgs)
 re: 1500 watts

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 14 Apr 93 12:07:53 EDT
From: UB.com!wetware!spunky.RedBrick.COM!psinntp!psinntp!ar1.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 1500 watts too much?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, karn@unix.ka9q.ampr.org (Phil Karn) writes:
>If too many more hams act like it's their God-given right to use 1500
>watts to talk to the guy across town, then I wouldn't be surprised to
>see the limits lowered. And then none of us would be able to use 1500
>watts even when it is fully justified and wouldn't interfere with
>anybody.

Even worse, we might have complex distance/frequency/power requirements
imposed on us and **really** make things a nightmare.

Jon Bloom, KE3Z		jbloom@ar1.org
American Radio Relay League		Justice is being allowed to do whatever
225 Main St.		I like. Injustice is whatever prevents
Newington, CT 06111		my doing so. -- Samuel Johnson

Date: 14 Apr 93 12:09:55 EDT
From: haven.umd.edu!darwin.sura.net!sgiblab!wetware!spunky.RedBrick.COM!psinntp!
psinntp!arrl.org@ames.arpa
Subject: 1500 watts too much?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, v111qheg@ubvmsb.cc.buffalo.edu (P.VASILION) writes:
>In article <1993Apr13.185928.1297@qualcomm.com>, karn@servo.qualcomm.com
writes...

>>In article <C5FKtp.IyI@athena.cs.uga.edu>, mcovingt@aisun3.ai.uga.edu (Michael
Covington) writes:

>>|> In short, QRO ham transmitters aren't the source of the strongest fields
>>|> that consumer gear has to endure, anyway.

>>

>>Is this really true? Sure, other consumer RF transmitters might cause
>>RFI, but because of their lower power levels (the legal ones, anyway)
>>the interference is more likely to be limited to the user's own TV or
>>stereo. While RFI is always objectionable, interfering only with your
>>own equipment is arguably much less of a public policy issue than
>>interfering with your neighbor.

>

> Like I said in my post, my 1.5 KW E and H field radiation from
>my 4 element monobander at 70 feet is far far less disruptive to my
>next door neighbor who is 100 feet away from the antenna than the 60 cycle
>AC his electric heater or his television set gives off. Don't for get that
>unless you run AM, your 1.5KW is NONCONTINUOUS! My CW QSO with Bovet lasts
>about 3 - 5 seconds. His viewing of TV lasts for hours.

On what basis do you consider the 60-Hz fields from his consumer
equipment more "disruptive" than your transmission? The 60-Hz field
isn't materially interfering with the operation of his other
appliances (e.g., TV), so clearly interfering RF signals are more
disruptive on that basis, regardless of who's at fault.

If, on the other hand, you are talking about biological effects, I'd
like a pointer to the research that leads to your conclusion. I'm not
aware that the existing science on the effects of either 60-Hz or
low-level RF fields supports such a general statement.

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League | Justice is being allowed to do whatever
225 Main St. | I like. Injustice is whatever prevents
Newington, CT 06111 | my doing so. -- Samuel Johnson

Date: 14 Apr 93 12:54:56 CDT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ncar!uchinews!raistlin!timbuk.cray.com!
hemlock.cray.com!cherry10!dadams@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 1500 watts too much?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 13799@n8emr.cmhnet.org, gws@n8emr.cmhnet.org (Gary Sanders) writes:
|People also see a tower and antenna and assume the problem is
|comming from there. I had problems with several neighbors even before
|the tower had antennas on it. I had only 4 of 6 sections up when a
|neighbor started complaing he was getting interference on his TV and
|stereos. I had a heck of time trying to convince him that it wasnt me.
|I was the only one with something visable he could blame. another neighbor
|blamed me when her microwave stop working and for the lighting storms
|in the area. I was "pulling in " storms with my antenna.

When I was about 16 I was interested in Ham radio. I began reading all
kinds of books on the subject and would carry them with me to and from
school.

I had this fellow threaten me with my life because I was causing interference
with his TV. (Nothing I could do would convince the guy it wasn't me.)

I did not own any radio equipment at the time. This fellow lived about 2
miles away.

I guess some people just have to think about radio to cause RFI. ;^)

On the other hand when I was in college I had this IBM PC clone that mucked
up TV reception for everyone in the apartment building whenever I used it.

While it may be cheaper to blame such problems on Ham radio, than to
require good component design, it will not solve the problems.

I think I will use my radio telepathic abilities now to send a message
to my congressman. Hmm, maybe I will think about interupting his cellular
phone conversation. ;^)

--David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com

When the hunger for liberty destroys order,
then the hunger for order will destroy liberty.

Date: 14 Apr 93 16:50:19 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!ub!dsinc!netnews.upenn.edu!prijat!
triangle.cs.uofs.edu!bill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 1500 watts too much?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C5ECqK.Hr3@athena.cs.uga.edu>, mcovingt@aisun3.ai.uga.edu (Michael Covington) writes:

|>
|> What do you all think?
|>

The only justification for having and using 1500 watts is to be louder than the guy next door with 1000 watts. I would personally like to see the limit set at about 500 watts max. I do not believe any other country (except maybe Canada) allows the power levels that we do. I personally know that I worked all the continents except Antarctica (there was no one there) during a one year period from Germany using SSB on a HW-101 and a W3DZZ trap dipole up about 30 feet. I had regular (3-4 times a week) skeds with the states and was heard just as well as I heard them.

Can anyone give a legitimate reason for using 1500 watts for a hobby??

bill KB3YV

PS. Yes, I have a linear capable of about 1200 watts PEP. It's been so long since I used it, I'm not even sure where I left it.

--

Bill Gunshannon | "There are no evil thoughts, Mr. Reardon" Francisco
bill@cs.uofs.edu | said softly, "except one; the refusal to think."
| #include <std disclaimer.h>

Date: Wed, 14 Apr 1993 19:44:29 GMT
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!linac!newsaintmail@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 1500 watts too much?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <11947@prijat.cs.uofs.edu> bill@triangle.cs.uofs.edu (Bill Gunshannon) writes:>

>Can anyone give a legitimate reason for using 1500 watts for a hobby??

>
>bill KB3YV

You of course are telling me that my running 1.5K for EME is wrong...

Kermit W9XA

p.s. care to include EME as legitimate use of power?

Date: 14 Apr 93 16:53:19 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!ub!dsinc!netnews.upenn.edu!prijat!
triangle.cs.uofs.edu!bill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 1500 watts too much?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Apr13.144109.55012@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>,
galen@picea.CFNR.ColoState.EDU (Galen Watts) writes:
>
> these kinds of problems wouldn't exist. They don't occur as much in Europe.
>

Of course, that could also be because Europeans aren't allowed
to run 1500 watts, too.

bill KB3YV

--

```
Bill Gunshannon      | "There are no evil thoughts, Mr. Reardon" Francisco  
bill@cs.uofs.edu     | said softly, "except one; the refusal to think."  
                     | #include <std disclaimer.h>
```

Date: Wed, 14 Apr 1993 13:04:55 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: CW = effective utilization?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr13.173936.29352@nnnnpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:
>amateur digital mode is less than it is for other modes. But the same
>thing is true for a ship's radio operator. They're already proficient in
>CW due to their job requirements, so it requires no additional effort for
>them to pass the amateur morse code exam. Why, where, and what you make
>
>73,
>Todd

>N9MWB

The U.S. Coast Guard's Radioman school consists of 5 months of 8-hours days building a person's communication skills and theoretical knowledge, including two hours per day of CW training; included in the graduation requirements were a minimum code speed of 22 WPM. So you might take that into consideration in regards to the remark above. Thus, the shipboard radio officer has not only put forth the effort to land a great job (no pun) but to also pass the amateur morse code exam.

Jeff, NH6IL

Date: Wed, 14 Apr 1993 13:15:28 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: Let each determine their own incentive!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr13.173945.29423@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>that the propogation aspects of the HF bands is significantly different
>than the VHF and above bands. Second, using your argument, the HF bands
>represent 0% of the amateur allocations, since we have access to
>everything above 300 GHz. Third is that due to the current stagnation in
>
>73,
>Todd
>N9MWB

Todd, did you fail 8th grade arithmetic? the HF allocation will never reach zero unless you were planning on operating at 'infinity' GHz (or whatever unit of measure: mHz, kHz, Hz; it would be the same 'frequency').

Jeff, NH6IL

Date: Wed, 14 Apr 93 17:21:04 GMT
From: agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@ames.arpa
Subject: Let each determine their own incentive!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr13.173945.29423@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>It *IS* forced on you to access 100% of the HF bands. The fact that the
>HF bands only represent 2% is meaningless for several reasons. One is
>that the propogation aspects of the HF bands is significantly different

>than the VHF and above bands.

Don't forget that the satellites are available, and are much more reliable than HF.

>Third is that due to the current stagnation in
>amateur radio, most of the activity in the amateur bands occurs in the HF
>bands. Although there is some VHF/UHF activity outside repeater operation,
>it doesn't amount to a lot.

I'd like to see some numbers to back this up. I suspect just the opposite is true, than the repeater segments see much more traffic than HF, especially given the larger audience.

I'm also not quite sure what you mean by "stagnation", which at the moment seems to be a thing of the past.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

Date: 14 APR 93 13:36:00
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nntpd.lkg.dec.com!ryn.mro4.dec.com!
cimfie.enet.dec.com!taber@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: re: 1500 watts
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <mwq52td@rpi.edu>, mellob@cary113.its.rpi.edu (Brett A. Mellor) writes...

>
> This is so true. Why should we, or anyone else for that
> matter, reduce power so manufacturers can keep the costs
> of making thier products down by not having to put filters, etc,
> in their equipment?
>

Here's the story: let's say it costs and extra dollar to make a TV set reject interference. Television sets (and everything else, for that matter) sell in "price bands." That is, if you group TVs, you'll note that like-featured sets sell for remarkably similar money. And the amounts are always just short of some divisible-by-ten amount. (E.g. \$179.95, \$299.95, etc.) To move up to the next feature set, you go to another tier of prices, say, \$50 higher. If you add a dollar to the cost of making the TV, you can't add a dollar to the price -- you either go up a band or stay in the band you're in.

Now, your interference-free TV is neat, but no consumer is going to pay an extra \$50 for it, so you have to eat that dollar. Make a million TV sets, and you have to explain to your investors why you flushed a million bucks down the drain. So you have your certified engineer come to the stockholders meeting and he/she/it explains about radio interference and all that jazz.

Then some stockholder who is more interested in putting their kid through school than making life good for techno-geeks asks what the chances are that any given TV set will take up residence next to a ham? Well, hams make up about one half of one percent of the population, so in one million people you'll find five thousand of them. Putting the worst blush on the case, you're saying that one set in 200 needs the fix that you've put in all of them. So you've spent \$200 per set of profit that should be sending the investor's kid through college to fix a problem that has small chance of occurring.

The guy who takes over the engineer's job will MCO the process to take that \$1 filter out and put a handfull of them into a bottom desk drawer somewhere. If a consumer writes in and complains, they'll mail the filter out with a form letter saying "We care about your satisfaction."

Who is wrong in this scenario? I honestly don't know. Is it really good engineering to spend the million bucks when five thousand bucks is all that's needed to fix the problem? Is it wrong of the investor to want to maximize profits? Should a problem for one half of one percent of the population drive design for the other 99.5%? It's not an easy question.

All that aside, the RF Design letter is a pretty classic piece of industry smokescreen. The author cites an extraordinary case, then effectively says "since it would be hard to fix this case, we shouldn't have to fix *any* case." then tries to shift the focus to some other group -- in this case hams. It's a classic. Similar things were done when the automobile industry or tobacco industry were trying to avoid unfavorable regulations.

>>>==>PStJTT

Date: Wed, 14 Apr 93 17:26:33 GMT
From: agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <626@toontown.ColumbiaSC.NCR.COM>, <C5119v.5rv@fmsystm.ncoast.org>, <25@n3igw.PGH.PA.US>

Subject : Re: Just waiting the OFs out

In article <25@n3igw.PGH.PA.US> sprouse@n3igw.UUCP (Ken Sprouse) writes:
>In article <C5119v.5rv@fmsystm.ncoast.org> andrews@fmsystm.ncoast.org (Andrew
Sargent N80FS) writes:
>>other comunistic Hams, talk _us_ down. Remember my friends, in 5
>>short years _we_ will take over_.
>What I want to know is when you give this speech at the local radio
>club, do you pound your shoe on the table? :-) Now that I think about
>it, if that line struck you as funny, you must be an OF. :-)

I also get a big giggle out of these types of pronouncements, especially given
the facts. It turns out that about 2/3 of codeless techs upgrade to tech plus
within a year. So the reality is that most of the growth is occurring in
the CW capable population. Go figure.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

Date: Wed, 14 Apr 1993 18:21:17 GMT
From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!concert!rock!cole@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr13.185928.1297@qualcomm.com>, <C5G0pu.LuM@acsu.buffalo.edu>,
<1993Apr14.124104.13799@n8emr.cmhnet.org>
Subject : Re: 1500 watts too much?

In article <1993Apr14.124104.13799@n8emr.cmhnet.org> gws@n8emr.cmhnet.org (Gary
Sanders) writes:

>
>People also see a tower and antenna and assume the problem is
>coming from there. I had problems with several neighbors even before
>the tower had antennas on it. I had only 4 of 6 sections up when a
>neighbor started complaining he was getting interference on his TV and
>stereos. I had a heck of time trying to convince him that it wasn't me.
>I was the only one with something visible he could blame.

This paragraph of litany is probably the main issue of why I don't put up a
vertical in the backyard. I certainly don't want to adversely affect anyone
via RFI/TVI/PI/whatever, but the fear of putting up with crap like this from
the neighbors (who in no way contribute to my mortgage payment, but feel they
can control my property) makes me not want to mess with it, while at the same
time burns me for having this feeling in the first place.

So, I make do with my "stealth" 40- and 20-meter dipoles.

> another neighbor
>blamed me when her microwave stop working and for the lighting storms
>in the area. I was "pulling in " storms with my antenna.

My first reaction at reading this part was "Jesus Christ". I can't believe that people could be/are THAT clueless. But, I guess I really shouldn't be surprised. When I was tying off my 40-meter dipole, a passer-by stopped and commented "What're ya doin', boy? Whazat? A deer stand? (Guffaw, guffaw)" Yes, my wife and I MEANT to buy where we did.

73 de KC4WEJ,
Derrick

--

"9. It fails the emissions test even when it's not running."

-- Top Ten Signs You've Bought A Bad Car

--

Derrick Cole KC4WEJ MCNC Center for Communications

Date: 14 Apr 93 13:52:17 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!pitt!n3igw!sprouse@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr4.054915.6242@nnnnpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<626@toontown.ColumbiaSC.NCR.COM>, <C5119v.5rv@fmsystem.ncoast.org>
Reply-To : sprouse@n3igw.UUCP (Ken Sprouse)
Subject : Re: Just waiting the OFs out

In article <C5119v.5rv@fmsystem.ncoast.org> andrews@fmsystem.ncoast.org (Andrew Sargent N80FS) writes:

>other comunistic Hams, talk _us_ down. Remember my friends, in 5
>short years _we will take over_.

^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

What I want to know is when you give this speech at the local radio club, do you pound your shoe on the table? :-) Now that I think about it, if that line struck you as funny, you must be an OF. :-)

--

Ken Sprouse / N3IGW sprouse@n3igw.pgh.pa.us
GEnie mail KSPROUSE
Packet radio n3igw@w2xo.pa.usa.noam
Compu\$erve 70145,426

Date: Wed, 14 Apr 93 12:41:04 GMT
From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!mstar!n8emr!gws@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C5FKtp.IyI@athena.cs.uga.edu>, <1993Apr13.185928.1297@qualcomm.com>,
<C5G0pu.LuM@acsu.buffalo.edu>+
Subject : Re: 1500 watts too much?

In article <C5G0pu.LuM@acsu.buffalo.edu> v111qheg@ubvmsb.cc.buffalo.edu
(P.VASILION) writes:
>In article <1993Apr13.185928.1297@qualcomm.com>, karn@servo.qualcomm.com
writes...
>>In article <C5FKtp.IyI@athena.cs.uga.edu>, mcovingt@aisun3.ai.uga.edu (Michael
Covington) writes:
>>|> In short, QRO ham transmitters aren't the source of the strongest fields
>>|> that consumer gear has to endure, anyway.
>>
>
> Like I said in my post, my 1.5 KW E and H field radiation from
>my 4 element monobander at 70 feet is far far less disruptive to my
>next door neighbor who is 100 feet away from the antenna than the 60 cycle
>AC his electric heater or his television set gives off. Don't for get that
>unless you run AM, your 1.5KW is NONCONTINUOUS! My CW QSO with Bovet lasts
>about 3 - 5 seconds. His viewing of TV lasts for hours.

People also see a tower and antenna and assume the problem is
comming from there. I had problems with several neighbors even before
the tower had antennas on it. I had only 4 of 6 sections up when a
neighbor started complaing he was getting interference on his TV and
stereos. I had a heck of time trying to convince him that it wasnt me.
I was the only one with something visable he could blame. another neighbor
blamed me when her microwave stop working and for the lighting storms
in the area. I was "pulling in " storms with my antenna.

--
Gary W. Sanders gws@n8emr.cmhnet.org, 72277,1325
N8EMR @ N8JYV (ip addr) 44.70.0.1 [Ohio AMPR address coordinator]
HAM BBS 614-895-2553 (1200/2400/V.32/PEP) Voice: 614-895-2552 (eves/weekends)

Date: Wed, 14 Apr 93 17:40:51 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!swrinde!gatech!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr7.140414.15415@ke4zv.uucp>,
<paulf.734203293@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>, <C569rq.7L9@squam.banyan.com>U
Subject : Re: No-code issue

In article <C569rq.7L9@squam.banyan.com> dts@banyan.com (Daniel Senie) writes:
>The original poster SPECIFICALLY said that he was ignoring the propagation issues
>to make a comparison.

No, he said he was ignoring the reuse phenomenon of propagation, not the fact
that half the bands are dead at any given time.

>First off, it's the D layer that does the absorbing. The E layer is generally
> responsible for short skip, when active.

That's what I get for posting before my morning coffee. Correct, D layer
absorption kills off the low bands during the day. The E layer really doesn't
play as big a part in HF as F1/F2.

> 80 meters is used in the morning and evening before the
>propagation gets good for DX for LOCAL communications.

So is VHF. The desired characteristic of HF is long distance communications,
thus the local reuse during the day is irrelevant.

>
>With bands that ARE open for F2 propagation, frequency re-use is entirely
>possible when the stations in 2 or more QSOs are arranged such that all are in
>the skip zones of the opposite QSOs.

As I said in my other rebuttal, reuse is statistically unlikely, owing to
the nonuniform distribution of amateur stations around the globe.

>Actually RTTY, AMTOR, PACTOR, Clover and HF Packet typically all squeeze into a
>tiny portion of the "CW" allocation.

That "tiny portion" is usually half of the non-ssb portion of the band.

>Except during contests, the CW ops are left LOTS of space by the
>digital mode folks. But then during CW contests, the digital mode folks can't
>find space in the digital subbands due to all the CW.

Hmmm, sounds like a pretty popular mode to me. In any event, almost all of
the "digital" modulation systems are based on a necessary bandwidth of 500Hz,
five times what a typical CW QSO takes up. Don't get me wrong, the automatic
modes are great for traffic handling. However, given the high delay tolerance
of that service, not much bandwidth is needed.

>Do you handle traffic? It does not sound like it.

As a matter of fact, I do now and then. All of it on VHF, not HF. As mentioned above, given the high delay tolerance, not much bandwidth is needed. And of course, the PACSATs give much more reliable service, and at VHF/UHF.

--

-Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #96
